

SECTION: REMARKS

This reply is submitted pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §132 and 37 C.F.R. §1.111. The Office Action was carefully considered by the undersigned attorney and applicant. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

As the Office Action was "Final", this reply is submitted under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The amendment complies with the findings of the examiner, and it is believed that it will require only a cursory review by the Examiner and that the amendment clearly places the application in a condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner should not find the application in a condition for allowance, the amendment is believed to remove issues for appeal and should accordingly be entered.

1. Summary of the Office Action.

Claims 1-10 were pending.

Claims 1,5,7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) over Averill (3,858,371)

Claims 1,5,7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) over Buchanan (4,332,116)

Claims 1,5,7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) over Bevacqua (4,930,270)

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, and 10 were objected to but found to contain allowable subject matter.

2. Discussion.

Applicant acknowledges with thanks the finding of allowable subject matter in this application.

Claim 1. Applicant amended the claim to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent claim 2.

Claim 2 was objected to, but was found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim. The amended claim is believed to be patentable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. Applicant notes that, claim 1 is a version of originally

submitted dependent claim 2, merely rewritten in independent form. Thus, no limiting amendment is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 2 is intended or should be considered made. Dependent **claim 2** is cancelled in view of this amendment.

Claim 5. Applicant amended the claim to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent claim 6.

Claim 6 was objected to, but was found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim. The amended claim is believed to be patentable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. Applicant notes that, claim 5 is a version of originally submitted dependent claim 6, merely rewritten in independent form. Thus, no limiting amendment is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 6 is intended or should be considered made. Dependent **claim 6** is cancelled in view of this amendment.

Claim 7. Applicant amended the claim to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent claim 8.

Claim 8 was objected to, but was found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim. The amended claim is believed to be patentable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. Applicant notes that, claim 7 is a version of originally submitted dependent claim 8, merely rewritten in independent form. Thus, no limiting amendment is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 8 is intended or should be considered made. Dependent **claim 8** is cancelled in view of this amendment.

Claim 9. Applicant amended the claim to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent claim 10.

Claim 10 was objected to, but was found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim. The amended claim is believed to be patentable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. Applicant notes that, claim 9 is a version of originally submitted dependent claim 10, merely rewritten in independent form. Thus, no limiting amendment

is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 10 is intended or should be considered made. Dependent **claim 10** is cancelled in view of this amendment.

Claim 11. This independent claim is new. The claim is based on independent claim 1 as filed and incorporates all of the elements of objected to dependent claim 3, which was found to contain allowable subject matter by the examiner. Accordingly, the claim is believed to be patentable.

Claim 12. This independent claim is new. The claim is based on independent claim 1 as filed and incorporates all of the elements of objected to dependent claim 4, which was found to contain allowable subject matter by the examiner. Accordingly, the claim is believed to be patentable.

3. Conclusion.

The claims pending after this amendment are believed to be patentable for the reasons stated above. The amendments are believed to be supported by the specification, claims and drawings as filed. It is believed that this case is now in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that telephone communication would advance the prosecution of this case to finality, he is invited to call at the number below.

It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a), provided a Petition is not submitted separately.

Please charge any fee due not paid by a check or credit card provided herewith, and/or charge any underpayment in any fee, and/or credit any overpayment in fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-2381.

<u>Any fees due are calculated as follows:</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Fee</u>
TOTAL claims remaining over that previously paid for:	None	\$0
INDEPENDENT claims remaining over that previously paid for:	2	\$86
	SUM claim fees:	\$86
EXTENSION fees:		\$210
OTHER fees:		\$0
	<u>TOTAL AMOUNT (if any)</u>	\$296
<input type="checkbox"/> Paid by enclosed check. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paid by enclosed Credit Card Payment Form(s) PTO-2038.		

Respectfully submitted,


Joel D. Skinner, Jr.
 Reg. No. 33,786

Date: 4-26-04

Skinner and Associates
 212 Commercial Street
 Hudson, Wisconsin 54016
 Tel.: (715) 386-5800
 FAX: (715) 386-6177
 Internet e-mail: info@skinnerlaw.com

cc: Pauli Laitinen, Esq. (For Records)